# HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 46 Saturday, November 12, 1955 Washington, D. C.

**News Section** *Printed in Three Sections*

**Palace Guard:** Washington observers are — it is generally agreed — a thick-skinned lot, accustomed to the sordid realities of national politics concealed by the headlines and high-sounding comments of editorial writers. Nevertheless, even the most hardened watcher of the Washington scene displays some disgust with the efforts of the Palace Guard to get President Eisenhower to run again.

In the past 20 years, the quadrennial exertions of these camarillas who surround (and usually shape the course of) presidents are a familiar phenomenon. No one who has once caught "Potomac fever" likes to relinquish power and the members of the Palace Guard (1953-5) are no different than their predecessors. On October 1, right after the President's stroke, this column warned that this would be one of the big factors in the interregnum government. Not only power, but fear of the loss of a job — by some who might even, in these busy times, find it difficult to get another — prompt these denizens of the White House to work frantically to ensure continuance of their key positions. It is a genuine fear; few in the Capital doubt that if, for instance, Nixon would take over the reins of power, he would clean house in the White House. The prevailing suspicion of what the Guard is plotting was well expressed in a broadcast on November 8 by NBC commentator Earl Godwin.

The indelicacy, not to mention cruelty, of these efforts to get a sick President to continue to bear the burdens of his high place has caused even some very cynical observers here to lift eyebrows.

One "caper" — details of which have begun to leak out — is described as follows: The White House crowd worked on various private friends and social companions of the President, to persuade them to write letters to the President (when he was in Denver) strongly expressing the hope that the ill Executive would run again. Some of these friends of Ike have yielded and, it is said, their letters suggested that only the President can maintain the present high level of business prosperity and can save the "spirit of Geneva." The President's reaction to such communications is not known.

**Off-Year Elections:** The battle of words between Republican and Democratic chieftains over the election results leaves neither side predominant, although opinion in Washington is that the Democrats have more reason to feel happy. But, out of the indeterminate mess of statistics, some political observers prefer to give thoughtful consideration to two results — in Indiana and in Kentucky:

(1) In the Hoosier state, the Democrats scored a big success by winning a large number of mayoralty contests. Some Democrats interpreted this to mean that the agricultural area vote was on the warpath against the GOP administration. In the Capital and in Indianapolis, experts are inclined to discount such an assertion; they prefer to emphasize the split within the state GOP as a bigger factor in the Democratic victories. This split came to a climax in the past year and a half — with Ike Republicans pitted against old Taft-following, grass-roots conservatives. The former won and took over the top machinery of the party, with many rancors remaining. Thus, a line-up appeared — a state party leadership influenced from Washington vs. a stubborn grass-roots, local-interest opposition. The result, it is claimed, weakened the GOP in Indiana and enabled the Democrats to win. The spectre looms — how widely will this classic split, conservatives vs. "liberal" leaders influenced by Washington, sway the countrywide voting next year in the general election? That is something for the GOP to eye with concern.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(2) Happy Chandler, as expected, won an easy victory over the Republican candidate in Kentucky. No particular orchids to the Democrats for that. But today the new Governor does loom as a big potential power in the open field of Democratic candidates for the presidential nomination race. Chandler's record is that of a right-of-center politico who in the past has gone along with the Southern conservatives in the Democratic party. Thus, he adds strength to the element in the party which includes Lausche of Ohio and Shivers of Texas. The conservative forces thereby acquire more strength.

**Democratic Concern:** Governor Frank J. Lausche scored a big victory in this week's elections in Ohio, when voters turned down — in referendum balloting — an amendment for supplemental layoff pay and increased state unemployment benefits. The amendment was demanded by the CIO to implement Reuther's victory over the auto manufacturers on the question of a Guaranteed Annual Wage. Lausche, who has consistently refused to play ball with the labor bosses, strongly condemned the measure. This Democratic Governor, well liked by Taft followers, ranks as one of the biggest vote-getters in Ohio's history. His triumph this week adds impetus to the growing national support for a "Lausche for President" movement next year.

This situation clearly has the Democratic New Deal political chieftains very worried. Two weeks ago, conservative Democratic Senator Richard Russell launched the boom for Lausche to head the Democratic ticket, and several other Southern leaders chimed in. This is the reason why numerous "liberal" columnists greeted the idea with some rather sour prose, brushing off the Ohio Governor as a "lone wolf." Since then these writers — actually pro-New Deal Democrats — have ignored the matter; they obviously don't want to give any substance to a widespread popular interest in the Ohioan, because a Lausche candidacy for the nomination would present the Democratic Party with a very hot problem.

In *Who's Who,* Mr. Lausche lists himself in his biography as "Democrat. Catholic." The Southern conservative Democrats, with Russell as their mouthpiece, by backing Lausche showed that the South no longer harbors the bigotry which proved such an obstacle to Governor Al Smith, Catholic, when he ran in 1928. Also, political observers in the Capital think that Lausche, if nominated on the Democratic ticket, would stand a much better chance than did Smith. The latter suffered not only from the religious issue, but also from the fact that he was a Tammany man and a "wet" at a time when Prohibition was a burning issue. Lausche is not connected with Tammany, indeed is opposed by city machines. And the liquor issue has disappeared. Lausche appeals to many labor union rank and file members who detest the labor bosses; it is no wonder that in Ohio he is regarded as a "friend of Taft." Furthermore, it is believed he would rally the disgruntled McCarthyites. Some national observers believe that Lausche, if nominated on the Democratic ticket, could sweep the country, even if Eisenhower were running.

In a presidential year, when the Democrats (even if Ike does not run) still face a big problem in overcoming the "peace and prosperity" cry of the GOP, he would seem a logical choice — if it were not for the opposition to him by the labor bosses. The labor union hierarchy controls or has great influence on many big-city state delegations to the convention. The labor bosses will undoubtedly oppose the Ohioan. Yet, cravenly bowing to labor boss rule, the Democrats might well lose many normally Democratic voters in urban areas, where the Republicans are reportedly gaining strength. Therein lies the Democratic dilemma — which is worrying not only the Democratic columnists but also the Democratic politicos who will have to choose the candidate at the convention next summer.

**Israel-Egypt Crisis:** Whatever the news stories and editorials may say about the Israel-Egypt crisis, the domestic political implications are prominent in all private discussions on the matter here in Washington. Whether the way the United States guides the policy will offend or satisfy the large Jewish vote in the key state of New York next year — that is the question, as the vote-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

getting politicos see it. So far, it's not favorable for the Republicans. Such political overtones should surprise no one. There was little said in public in 1947-8, but what was privately said behind the scenes is now a matter of public record, due to publication of the *Forrestal Diaries* and other works. James G. Forrestal was Secretary of Defense under Truman in the election year 1948 and sought to take the whole Middle East question out of politics by a bipartisan agreement. He failed, and has left a record of his failure in his *Diaries*.

In a book, *What Price Israel*, by Alfred Lilienthal (published by Henry Regnery Company, 20 West Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill., $3.95) which we have mentioned previously, the author relates the story quoting from the *Diaries* of Forrestal, whose life was shortened by this and other conflicts within the Truman Executive. "One of the staunchest advocates of a strong pro-Israel policy was at that time the newly elected Congressman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. Forrestal told young Roosevelt of his present efforts and of the 'methods used by people outside of the executive branch of the Government to bring coercion and duress on other nations of the General Assembly which bordered closely on to scandal' [quoted in *Diaries*]. FDR, Jr., said it was impossible to get the two parties to agree not to press the issue and that 'the Democratic Party would be bound to lose and the Republican to gain by such an agreement.' Forrestal's significant answer was: 'I think it is about time that somebody should pay some consideration to whether we might not lose the United States.' "

**Aid To Education:** What is wrong with the current propaganda picture of the school situation — a picture of overcrowded classrooms, localities lacking funds, underpaid school teachers, scanty building programs, etc., etc.? That question is answered by those who read the preliminary statistics of state school systems, published by the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The statistics include a survey of 1953-4 which shows that as compared with two years previously (1951-2), pupil enrollment has risen over 8 per cent. At the same time, money spent for building and equipment jumped 41 per cent. This — as seen in Washington — destroys the gloomy picture of skimpy building appropriations. At the same time, teachers' salaries rose over 10 per cent.

In other words, localities have been putting their shoulders to the wheel, in building and staffing schools at an increasing pace, while socialistic zealots — intent on Federal aid to and control over schools — have sought to place the burden on the Federal Government. This more accurate picture of what really has been going on reinforces the growing feeling that the people have been receiving a false version of what is actually the real situation as to school facilities from the propagandists for Federal Aid to Education. Earlier this year, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare released a forecast of a shortage of 407,000 classrooms by 1960. However, the figures were so widely challenged that, after a checkup, a correction was made, reducing the alleged shortage to 176,000 classrooms.

But — it is now asked here — is this latter figure also accurate? For the latest Federal report showing generous outlays of spending and enrollment by localities really "dates." It dates actually from 1953-4. The Indianapolis *Star* examining the matter comments on the time lag in statistics and wants to know what the current figures for 1955 indicate. The *Star* points out that when Congress next session is asked to act on Federal aid to education, such action will be on the basis of figures of two years ago, which will be then nearing three years of age. The *Star* comments: "In a situation which the department's own figures show to be rapidly changing, this procedure does not make sense. The department owes it to the administration, the Congress and to the nation to provide currently accurate information on the school situa-

**Letter from LEE H. BRISTOL, President, Bristol-Myers Company:** "I am a constant reader of HUMAN EVENTS. I believe it does a good job of reflecting a viewpoint not to be found anywhere else."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, rather than information and conclusions based on conditions of three to five years ago."

Washington finds this comment particularly pertinent this month, as the date (December 1) of the White House "loud-speaker" Conference on Education approaches. This meeting — believed to be heavily weighted with pro-Federal aid advocates — will seek to make a recommendation on the basis of figures which are rapidly changing, as noted in the Federal report mentioned above.

**Hoover:** Yesterday at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington, across the Potomac from Washington, former President Herbert Hoover uttered these words: "We dedicate ourselves again to maintain that pride in our nation which surges from a thousand rills of heroic deeds, of sacrifice and its mighty stream of achievement. Those who fought and died had no belief that patriotism was a sin and pride in nation was an evil. They marched with our flag before their eyes and our national anthem on their lips."

**The Christmas gift** that will be most appreciated by your conservative friends is a subscription to HUMAN EVENTS.

**Five Amendments:** Can the five amendments described in the article section of this issue of HUMAN EVENTS be passed? A certain Senator who read proofs of the article says, "Yes," adding: "Let me remind you of the campaign that stopped Roosevelt's Supreme Court Packing bill."

After the 1936 Democratic landslide, Roosevelt said he wanted a Court that would "cooperate." He wanted Justices with whom he could confer about his great plans for social and economic reform.

Roosevelt expected only nominal opposition to his court-packing proposal. After all, there were only 12 Republicans in the Senate and 89 Republicans in the House. But Democrats like Senators Wheeler, Burke, Glass and Byrd reacted violently against his proposal. They set out to organize the Senate opposition.

The defeat of court-packing occurred only partly because of the courage of a dozen leading Senators. There were many "waverers" whose vote depended on the sentiment back home. Frank E. Gannett, to build up grass-roots opposition, organized the Committee for Constitutional Government with Dr. Edward Rumely in charge. The Committee flooded this country with leaflets — by the millions. As a result, the anti-packing mail to members of Congress consistently exceeded the pro-packing mail — even after Roosevelt's two radio addresses appealing for support.

Said the Senator: "If court-packing — with the odds so overwhelming in FDR's favor — can be defeated, the five amendments necessary to preserve our constitutional liberties can be passed."

**Between Covers:** The *American Mercury* for November contains a sensational article entitled "The Foreign Aid Sieve" by Robert Donlevin. The article documents — for the first time — "the fantastic truth that the very countries that assert the duty of the United States to help them with capital investments have been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars a year into the politically and economically secure United States capital market. The total amount of capital that has fled from countries receiving our aid or that has been invested by their nationals in private gold hoards may even exceed the total amount of our foreign aid since 1954 — a whopping $50 billion."

**TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.**

**Pre-publication price** *(only until December 31)* on 1955 BOUND ANNUAL VOLUME with complete index, $7.50. After January 1, $15. A few 1954 Bound Volumes are available at $15.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
*Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D.C. Copyright 1955.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 46 HUMAN EVENTS November 12, 1955

**Article Section (I)**

## FIVE AMENDMENTS ARE NEEDED To Preserve Our Constitutional Liberties

*By* JAMES L. WICK

**THE MOST important consequence of a conservative victory in 1956 would be the proposal to the states and the ratification by 36 legislatures of five amendments to the Constitution. The five amendments must be approved if the 20-year erosion of the Constitution is to be stopped.**

**The Mundt-Coudert Amendment** would cut down the abnormal power of New York State and New York City to determine the presidential nominations of both parties. With 266 electoral votes necessary to elect a President, 45 can be obtained from New York. The New York plurality can be obtained only by catering to several special interest pressure blocs — whose influence therefore becomes 10 to 100 times that of the same number of persons in other states.

Under the present state unit system of counting electoral votes, the Empire State is well-nigh indispensable to the Republicans; no Republican since Rutherford B. Hayes has been elected to the White House without New York. The Democrats have won twice without it — Wilson in 1916 and Truman in 1948 — because they carried enough offsetting Southern States.

The Republican party is primarily the party of the region west of the Hudson River — of the farms and small towns and the cities under 400,000. Its support comes from the middle class, the thrifty and the self-reliant, the one-third of union membership who, in the interest of their children, takes the long-term view; in brief, Republicans tend to be those who believe in the Judeo-Christian concept of individual responsibility.

The existing system puts the GOP in an unnatural position in presidential years. Its presidential nominee and platform must be acceptable to a large enough number in New York City to carry the state. Yet New York City really belongs to the New Deal which gets the bulk of its vote from big city machine-controlled blocs. These voters go to the polls docilely to pull the levers as ordered by the labor and political bosses; 95 per cent can not name even the Congressman representing them.

The Mundt-Coudert amendment would — as now — give each state the number of electors equal to its delegation in Congress. But those electors would be chosen in the same manner as the Senators and Representatives are elected.

The Presidential nominees who get state-wide pluralities would be given two electors to correspond to the two Senators. The nominees would also get the elector from each Congressional district in which they poll a plurality. (This system was in existence from 1789 until the Administration of Andrew Jackson.)

Under this method, the power of the Big City states in national conventions would be greatly reduced. The electoral system would be brought into conformity with the Constitution which makes all states equal in the Senate and gives them House membership in ratio to their population. The President and the Congress elected with him would derive their offices from the same constituencies.

**The Reed-Dirksen Amendment** would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 per cent — except when three-fourths of each house of Congress vote for a higher rate. In that case, however, if the bottom rate exceeds 25 per cent, the top rate cannot be more than 15 percentage points higher than the bottom rate.

Today the revenue that comes from the individual income tax rates above the 35 per cent mentioned above amounts to only $2.4 billion — out of more than $60 billion collected in federal tax revenues.

The Reed-Dirksen amendment also would deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and would leave these sources of revenue to the states where they belong. Competition among the states would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. The revenue derived from these taxes is only one per cent of the total federal budget — enough to pay the government's expenses for no more than three days.

The argument for a limitation upon the taxing power of the federal government has been well stated by Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn:

"Since the beginning of our country, the states have been limited generally in what they could take from the people in taxes. The counties are all limited. They can take only 2 or 3 per cent of the assessed valuation for local governmental purposes. Generally, the cities are limited, too.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You can elect a Socialist mayor of Bridgeport or Milwaukee and go to sleep at night knowing that he cannot do much to hurt you. The citizens have drawn the old purse strings tight and limited the borrowing, taxing, spending, and corruption of the local governments.

"So the only sure way you can reduce the burdens and corruption in the federal government is to reduce the size and functions of government itself and the amount it can spend. Until then, it will remain in corruption, unlimited, because the welfare state is by its very nature corrupt. We must redefine the constitutional limitations so that even if we should elect a Socialist President, we can still sleep in peace at night. Unfortunately, it isn't possible now.

"For 125 years, up to 1916, Presidents were limited. The federal government could not even levy an income tax. It had to live by excise taxes and tariffs. But in 1913, a new kind of constitutional amendment was passed which for the first time in our history extended, instead of further limiting, the power of government to tax and spend.

"All amendments to the Constitution except this Sixteenth Amendment are designed to restrict and tie down the federal government rather than enlarge its power. The counterrevolution against hard-won constitutional liberty in America started in 1913. Now little is left of the constitutional limitations on government except the Bill of Rights. The unrestricted power to tax has destroyed them. We have now an unlimited welfare state instead of a limited constitutional Republic.

**"As we look back, it becomes crystal clear that the real genius of our form of government was the limitation on what government could do. It was not representative government, or the checks and balances so much talked about. It was not popular voting. Jefferson pointed it out so well when he said, 'Do not talk to me about the integrity of public officials: I say: chain the politicians to the limitations of the Constitution itself.'**

"So the authors of the American constitution chained the federal politicians to make sure the individual might be free."

**The Byrd-Bridges Amendment** would require Congress to impose federal taxes sufficient to provide revenues at least equal to the appropriations except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the U.S. is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy.

The object is to make illegal the unbalanced budget which is the cause of inflation, the most unjust of all forms of taxation.

**The Bricker Amendment** would prevent treaties or other international agreements from having any force or effect if they conflict with any provision of the Constitution. A treaty and other international agreement would not become a part of our internal law unless implemented by appropriate legislation.

Frank E. Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, summed up the case for the Bricker amendment in this paragraph:

"During recent years, by changes in judicial concept (both of Courts and jurists) and by changed concepts in the international point of view, 'treaty law' has become omnipotent, a kind of Frankenstein which can change and even destroy the liberties of the American people and their form of government. Thus, the need for a constitutional amendment is self-evident — except, of course, to those who believe (honestly or otherwise) that the American constitutional system and American independence are outmoded and, in the interest of mankind, in general, should yield to some form of world government. This is the choice and the issue."

The parliamentary strategy to pass the Bricker amendment was blocked in the Senate by one vote because the President, who under the Constitution, has no authority on the subject of amendments, indicated his disapproval. Senator Ferguson voted against the Bricker amendment, apparently, because he wanted a Presidential appointment in case he was defeated for re-election. Ironically, he lost — by an eyelash — because of the angry GOP stay-at-home reaction to his vote against the Bricker amendment. However, he did get the appointment; he is now Ambassador to the Philippines.

**The Reed-Walter Amendment** would permit the Constitution to be amended entirely by action — both proposal and ratification — by three-fourths of the state legislatures — completely bypassing Congress. It seems certain that the five amendments discussed in this article will get the approval of 36 legislatures if they are given a chance to vote on them.

**IT IS HEARTENING — and symptomatic of the trend — to discover that literally hundreds of conservative political organizations have spontaneously sprung into being in the last three or four years and that most of them in the last three months have voted to crusade for "The Five Amendments."**

**To return America to rule by the people — by ALL the people, rather than principally by the special interest pressure groups in the Big City states — "The Five Amendments" must become part of the Constitution — and soon!**

---

Additional copies of this 2-page Section: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

---

James L. Wick is executive publisher of HUMAN EVENTS. He was national defense specialist for the Republican National Committee in 1940 and was a member of Governor Dewey's research staff in 1944. He is the author of a book analyzing the 1940, 1944 and 1948 campaigns — appropriately titled: "How NOT to Run for President, a Handbook for Republicans."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 46 HUMAN EVENTS November 12, 1955

**Article Section (II)**

## THE $14 BILLION ILLNESS

*By* EDWARD F. HUTTON

**When Senator Huey Long,** Kingfish of the Bayous, was assassinated, the market value of Louisiana's bonds advanced ten points. That's quite a story. It was the judgment of the owners that they would be more surely paid when the Kingfish was six feet below — permanently.

When President Roosevelt died, April, '45, security values rose, but not spectacularly.

However, when it was reported that President Eisenhower was ill, it caused the biggest decline, or "break," in one day on the New York Exchange since October, 1929, market values showing a loss of $14 billion. This was not news of death, thank God, but of illness only.

Shares of hundreds of other companies listed on exchanges in America, Canada, London, Paris, Berlin and Rome also sharply dropped in value.

The political implications of President Eisenhower's illness will not be reported for some time, even though he soon recovers.

But this $14 billion "break," on the first trading day after his illness became known, is something no Left-wing New Dealer will ever forget, and which the public will always remember. Nothing like that has ever happened in recorded history.

**Those to the right** will say that this was a measure of confidence in the wisdom and integrity of a great man.

But how will those to the Left construe it? They'll probably laugh it off on the ground that this is a "businessman's" administration: so what?

This theory would be valid if the owners of business were the only ones who have been prospering. But — who believes that? The 65,000,000 men and women now at work know better.

Some 1,250 concerns are listed on the New York Exchange, where their shares are daily bought and sold in the largest free market place in the world. These securities, or shares, are owned directly by 7,000,000 or more people — Republicans, Democrats and Left-wing liberals alike.

In addition, tens of millions more people are indirect owners of these shares, as life-insurance policyholders, bank depositors, pension fund participants, etc. And, millions of dollars in such shares are owned by big labor unions.

On August 31, the value of shares listed on the New York Exchange was $198 billions — by far the biggest share of all incorporated businesses, furnishing jobs to tens of millions of people. And this is only one of nineteen security exchanges in our country.

When Vice President Truman became President in 1945, in humility, he asked the people to pray for him.

Business then had a breathing spell, security markets were quiet and slowly regaining confidence. There was no impact of hostility against business — that came late in 1947 and 1948. Then, when Mr. Truman was elected President, "the roof fell in," and security values declined again.

**The left-wing "liberals"** are against the freedom of enterprise. At times, they give lip service to it, but at heart they promote measures to destroy it. They are for human rights versus property rights, as if the right to own property was not one of the most valuable of all human rights.

When President, Mr. Truman stated: "I believe that the Constitution, which rightly protects property, is still more deeply pledged to protect human rights," the implication being that the Federal government would assume the obligation of protecting human rights, the meaning of which is planned economy — socialism, whose handmaiden is further exploitation toward "seizure" of the earnings of our people, who are the taxpayers, consumers and voters. It was that uncertainty which caused the "break" in value of the security holdings of thousands and thousands of our citizens.

**It was the New Deal** that put government into business. Contrariwise, Mr. Eisenhower wants to deal it out — take the country from the bureaucrats and give it back to America.

There have been thousands of words written and spoken by editors of the press here at home, and in foreign lands, respecting the illness of our President, and political and constitutional questions. Never has a President of these United States, in illness, caused the fear and uncertainty of coming events.

The question now is whether our competitive constitutional system is to continue in the business world or whether we are to have planned economy under the leadership of the New and Fair Dealers.

Seems to me the opponents of President Eisenhower will now think twice before pounding the war drums that business is some sort of enemy to the voters.

---

Edward F. Hutton is a Wall Street broker.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**BOOK REVIEW:** ***Das Andere Preussen,*** by Hans Joachim Schoeps. Freidrich Vorwerk, Publisher, Stuttgart, Germany. Reviewed by F. A. Voigt.

Sir Winston Churchill tells us in the fifth volume of his work *The Second World War* that he was determined to deal "more sternly" with Prussia than with the rest of Germany (p. 318) and that Prussia was "the source of the recurring pestilence" of aggressive warfare (p. 141). At Teheran he put his views to President Roosevelt who, although objecting that the other Germans were no better than the Prussians, did agree that Prussia was a special case. Marshal Stalin thought that all Germans "fought like beasts" but it was "the Prussian officers who provided the cement."

The view that Prussia was always the arch-aggressor, exercising a brutal domination over all other Germans, prevailed during the First World War and persists to the present day. The Austrians were, and still are, considered more charming and less aggressive — even Stalin thought the Austrians "were different." What are the facts?

Having exhausted every possibility of conciliation, Bismarck defeated Austria after a brief campaign in 1866, thereby ending her efforts to dominate the German States. He successfully insisted on a peace without annexations. Under Prussian leadership, Germany became a Federation in which Prussia, although the biggest of the Federal States, never exercised anything that could be called "domination" over the others. The ideal of a centralized German State was opposed by Bismarck and the Prussian conservatives. It was passionately advocated by German liberals and socialists who wanted to include Austria in the union.

Bismarck exhausted all possibilities of conciliation before Germany went to war with France in 1870. It was France who declared war amid the enthusiasm of the Parisian crowds. Germany fought and won that war as a Federation of States. In that war, it was the Bavarians, not the Prussians, who gained a reputation for brutality.

It was Austria who started the First World War. After Germany's defeat, it was the liberal and socialist revolution which whittled down the rights of the Federal States and strengthened the powers of the central executive. In the new German Republic, Prussia became the principal stronghold of democracy, Bavaria of reaction — and aggressive reaction at that.

Hitler was an Austrian who did not become a German citizen until 1932. He was a revolutionary nationalist, a socialist, a man of the Left — he was anti-conservative, anti-royalist, anti-Prussian and, in his early years, radically anti-capitalist. It was Hitler who finally extinguished the federal structure of Germany. He reduced the territory of Prussia and merged her into the centralized Reich. Amongst the principal members of his Cabinet there were no Prussians. But Prussia, especially her nobility, was strongly represented amongst those who attempted his assassination.

In the book under review, Hans Schoeps shows that there were, amongst the Prussian conservatives of the nineteenth century men of great vision, with a wide European view. Like Bismarck himself, they were opposed to nationalism and to revolution and were consistently for permanent peace with England and Russia. They were distrustful of France because she was, in those days, a stronghold of revolution and international unrest. Schoeps also shows how deep was the regard of many Prussian conservatives for British and American institutions.

He is particularly illuminating on Karl Marx as a predecessor of Hitler. Prussia successfully prevented the Crimean War from spreading — and perhaps from becoming a world war — by holding Austria back from participation. She was, for this reason, attacked with savagery and contempt by Karl Marx whose life-long dream was a world war because world war meant world revolution. Writing in the New York *Herald Tribune* (April 24, 1854) he exhorted the Powers to join England in a crusade against Russia. Later on, he anticipated Hitler's racial theories. In a letter written on June 24, 1865, he asserted that the Russians were "Asiatics" who did not even belong to "the indogermanic race" (which Hitler called the "Aryan" race), that they were "intruders" and must be driven "back across the Dnieper." Schoeps might have added that in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law*, Marx, like Hitler after him, equated the Jews with capitalism — "haggling," he wrote, is their "worldly culture" and "money" is their "worldly God."

Anti-Semitism was at its worst in Austria. When Hitler was rising to power, the anti-Semitic outrages in Vienna were spontaneous, the excesses of the mob. The people of Berlin were disgusted. For the conquest of Germany, including Prussia, Hitler used Bavaria as an operational base. Today, "Hitlerism" is strongest in Austria, especially amongst the young (it has almost no following amongst the younger generation in Germany).

When our three profound statesmen decided on the extinction of Prussia at Teheran, they did not seem to have known that Hitler had completed the work of extinction years before. Nor did the Allied Military Government seem to have known when, on February 25, 1947, it passed a "law" abolishing the Prussian "State."

Additional copies of this 2-page Section: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED